

## **QUESTION AND ANSWERS FOR 2006 RFP**

Q1. - What is the ITB# for the Compliance Monitoring proposal (tenant file audits and physical inspections)?

**A. - There is no ITB (Invitation to Bid) number assigned to the Compliance Monitoring Request for Proposals (RFP). The RFP should be referred to as the "MSHDA Compliance Monitoring RFP for Tenant File Audits and Physical Inspections".**

Q2. - Please inform me of the steps that I need to take to obtain a copy of the proposal of the vendor that was awarded the contract for the Compliance Monitoring.

**A. - Requests for information on previous RFP responses can be made under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). FOIA requests must be in writing and sent to Clarence Stone with a copy to Cassandra Brown. The FOIA request can be sent via mail, fax or e-mail. Any such request would be subject to the rules of FOIA and must be specific enough for a staff person to locate the requested items.**

**Address: Michigan State Housing Development Authority  
Attn: Clarence Stone and Cassandra Brown  
735 E. Michigan Avenue, P.O. Box 30044  
Lansing, MI 48909**

**E-mail: Clarence Stone: stonec@michigan.gov  
Cassandra Brown: browncas@michigan.gov**

**Fax: 517-241-8471**

Q3. - Who is the current performing contractor for the Compliance Monitoring?

**A. - Requests for information regarding current MSHDA Compliance Monitoring contractors for file audits and/or physical inspections can be made under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). FOIA requests must be in writing and sent to Clarence Stone with a copy to Cassandra Brown. The FOIA request can be sent via mail, fax or e-mail. Any such request would be subject to the rules of FOIA and must be specific enough for a staff person to locate the requested items.**

**Address: Michigan State Housing Development Authority  
Attn: Clarence Stone and Cassandra Brown  
735 E. Michigan Avenue, P.O. Box 30044  
Lansing, MI 48909**

**E-mail: Clarence Stone: stonec@michigan.gov  
Cassandra Brown: browncas@michigan.gov**

**Fax: 517-241-8471**

Q4. - On Page 3, Overview of Contractor Responsibilities, the note at the end states "Section 8 MR developments will be audited by MSHDA Asset Management staff". During the past contract we found that most of these developments had Section 236 financing. Will MSHDA Asset Management staff be auditing those?

**A. - Compliance Monitoring file audit contractors will continue to perform file audits on Section 236 developments and on the Section 8 developments with Section 236 funding or LIHTC.**

Q5. - Is there any way to break down the total number of units on your county map to show the number of units subject to file audit? There could be a substantial drop in the number of units reviewed with the change noted in Section 2 of the RFP.

**A. - Attached is a report of all Section 8 developments. This report includes the funding summary, LIHTC status, city, county and number of units and will provide sufficient information to calculate which developments will be included in the Compliance Monitoring portfolio. This report is provided in Excel so that it can be easily sorted by county or any other desired field.**

**Note: Section 8/LIHTC developments with inactive LIHTC status will not be audited by Compliance Monitoring file audit contractors because those properties are now only monitored for Section 8 and MSHDA Asset Management will audit those developments.**

Q6. - The proposed fee schedule would suggest that a third of all properties will be inspected each year of the contract. Under Scope of Services 6.2, the frequency of inspections would appear to be somewhat greater (a mix of annual and tri-annual, based on program type). Can you clarify what level of annual activity to expect?

**A. - The formulas used on MSHDA's proposed fee schedule are for estimated purposes only. MSHDA has approximately 450 properties that have annual inspection requirements, approximately 800 that are tri-annual, and several properties are bi-annual. MSHDA will give a detailed list of properties due for inspection each year to the selected contractor(s).**

Q7. - The RFP provides for the possibility of multiple awards. Is the Authority pre-disposed toward them? This bears on the relative economies of scale associated with the opportunity. Is MSHDA open to alternative pricing structures, based on the number of regions awarded (i.e. one fee structure for the entire portfolio and another for individual regions)?

**A. - The Authority is not pre-disposed toward multiple awards. MSHDA will review all proposals and make a determination to award the contract to the firm, institution or agency, either in whole or in part, as deemed to be in the best interest of the Authority. The Authority will award contract(s) based on the most responsive and responsible offer(s) proposed and based upon the criteria specified in the RFP.**

**A proposal may be submitted for one region, a combination of regions, or the entire state. RFP Section 8.1 states that a contractor may submit multiple county and fee structure options. (i.e. Option #1 - inspections for entire state at one**

**price, Option #2 - inspections for two regions at the same price, Option #3 - inspections for two regions at different prices, etc.)**

Q8. - The sample contract calls for the provision of professional liability insurance. Such insurance is reasonably required, and readily available on commercial terms, for design and engineering services. It is not likely to be available, certainly not on favorable commercial terms, for basic inspection services. HUD and many other agencies accept general liability insurance for efforts like those contemplated here. Would MSHDA consider general liability insurance instead of professional liability insurance here?

**A. - Professional liability insurance is not required, however it will be considered during the RFP proposal review and evaluation process. Also please note that the contract posted with the RFP is a draft and all provisions are subject to revision.**